

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



April 2011 No 563

IN GOD WE TRUST – ANYONE ELSE MIGHT BE LYING

WHY THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION IS A FAILURE

By Stephen Goodson, South Africa

It is not often that one has an opportunity to confront one's adversaries and ask penetrating questions without fear of arrest or retribution, as may well have been the case if the following encounter had taken place in the allegedly "freest" Germany of all time.

On the evening of Monday, 24 January 2011, I attended a symposium entitled "21 and 15 years on: To what Extent Can Germans and South Africans Enjoy their Respective 'Living' Constitutions?", sponsored by the German Consulate General in Cape Town.

The South African panellists were advertised as Pius Langa, former president of the South African Constitutional Court, and Roelf Meyer, former Minister of Constitutional Affairs, who was chief negotiator at Kempton park, Johannesburg, 1992-1996, and who played a leading role in selling South Africa out to the international banking cartel behind the smokescreen of majority rule. After his election, President Thabo Mbeki personally thanked David Rockefeller for his invaluable support in this regard.

The German panellists were represented by emeritus Professor Hans-Peter Schneider, a former member of a number of provincial – Laender – Constitutional Courts, and Professor Herta Daeubler-Gmelin, a former Minister of Justice, 1998-2002, and member of the Bundestag. During her term of office Frau Gmelin was responsible for introducing same sex "marriages" or civil unions, and for fining and jailing hundreds of "thought criminals". But she was fired from her post in 2002 after comparing the methodology of President George W Bush in Iraq to that of Adolf Hitler. Her leader, SPD chief Gerhard Schroeder, who apologized profusely to Bush, said at the time that he could not sit at the same Cabinet table with someone who had connected Bush to a criminal.

In the event, of the four invited panellists, only Professor Schneider was present. The South Africans were indisposed and Frau Gmelin's flight was delayed.

Three Points

In the spirit of clarification, I directed the following three points to Professor Schneider:

1. Two days prior to the enactment of the German constitution on 23 May 1949, a Secret Treaty –Geheimer Staatsvertrag – was signed, which gave complete Allied control over electronic and print media, film, culture and education until the year 2099. As a result thereof, there are still 100,000 occupation troops in Germany; after 66 years there still has been no peace treaty concluded between Germany and the Victorious Allied Powers; and all of Germany's gold reserves are held in the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in which the Rothschilds have a 57% shareholding. This treaty has been confirmed by Major-General Gerd-Helmut Komossa, former

head of German Military Intelligence in his book "Die Deutsche Karte" – The German Card.

2. There appear to be two constitutions. According to a resolution of the Constitutional Court – Verfassungsgericht – of 17 August 1956, "It is upheld that the German Reich has outlasted the collapse of 1945 and has never gone under or fallen, either through capitulation or through the exertion of foreign state authority in Germany by the Allies, or in the later course of time; it is still an entity with legal capacity, even though it is not fully operable as a government due to a lack of organization. The Federal Republic of Germany is NOT the successor of the German Reich".

It needs to be noted that the Constitution of the Third Reich dates back to the North German Constitution of 1866. The principal reason why it still exists is because only the German High Command surrendered on 8-9 May 1945, and not the German Government. Furthermore, the 1949 Constitution is termed the Basic Law, because it is a provisional constitution, pending unification of the lost territories. So far, only central Germany has been reunified – 3 October 1990. The eastern territories, as defined by the 1937 borders, still remain under Polish and Russian control.

3. Freedom of expression is guaranteed by Section 5 of the Basic Law –Grundgesetz, but it is clearly contradicted by Section 130 of the Criminal Code –Strafgesetzbuch – under the heading 'Agitation of the People'. Any alternative view of the Establishment's version of history is punishable by up to 5 years in prison – 12 years in the case of Horst Mahler, and thousands of innocent people have been jailed or fined.

I will give two brief examples, Dr Wilhelm Stäglich from Hamburg was forced to resign as a judge and lost 20% of his pension for five years for publishing a book about World War II, *Der Auschwitz Mythos*. In a letter to me dated 21 October 1990, he wrote: "...In Germany the book has been banned forever." My second example concerns German Rudolf, who graduated in Chemistry at Bonn University and was a researcher at the Max Planck Institute. In 1992 he wrote a scientific report about the so-called concentration camps in the east, which was peer reviewed by over 300 professors of Inorganic Chemistry. Not one of them could find a single mistake. He was sentenced to 2 ½ years in prison for writing this Report.

Finally, I wish to quote a sentence from Professor Dr Ernst Nolte, who was a witness at the recent Kevin Käther trial in Berlin: "Such questioning must be allowed, or else scientific truth in this area of history is ruled out – this is simply not a possibility."

The Result

Halfway through the third question, the moderator of the symposium requested a "termination", in other words, he

wished to stop the questioning. Professor Schneider only replied to this, the third question, saying flatly that freedom of speech is protected by the Constitution and that the Criminal Code is there to protect it from "hate" speech.

After the symposium ended for the public, I expanded on the rest of my question to him as well as mentioning that the famous German historian, Professor Helmut Diwald, had had his book, *Geschichte der Deutschen* pulped in the late 1970s, after he had written – p.165, that whatever happened to the Jews who were evacuated to the east after 1940 is "still unexplained with regard to the central questions, in spite of all that has been written." Professor Schneider seemed to agree that such questions needed to be treated more seriously.

Regarding the secret Treaty discussed in point 1. above, Schneider said that he was unable to say whether it was true or false. There has been much debate about its authenticity, but the fact is that the provisions contained in it have all been applied.

Concerning the constitution of the Third Reich never having been abrogated, as discussed in point 2. above, he admitted that it still exists, but apparently only so that those who worked during that period could still receive their pensions!

The Crux

The crux of any constitution is the unfettered right to freedom of expression. This has recently – 3 June 2010 – been formulated by the Human Rights Council, a subsidiary of Unesco, as follows: "The exercise of the right to freedom of opinion and expression is one of the essential foundations of a democratic society, and is instrumental to the development and strengthening of effective democratic systems." Until this right has been restored in Europe, injustice and repression will persist, notwithstanding Germany's false claim of being a Constitutional state – "Rechtsstaat".

During the discussions, it was revealed that there had been a steady decline in the participation of the German people in the party political system. Furthermore, large-scale violent riots had erupted because of the dumping of nuclear waste in Lower Saxony and the construction of a new underground railway station in Stuttgart, indicative of general dissatisfaction and possibly a new direction.

Another indication was the finding by a recent opinion poll that 89% of Germans do not believe the official version of 9/11, a hopeful development, no doubt spurred on by the Internet.

The response to my questions and points from the audience of about 60 people was muted, and was epitomized by the glum look on the face of the Consul General. However, afterwards a former Jewish student of political philosophy and a black film maker both said that they found it an intriguing revelation that Germany was still under the control of foreign powers.

Hopefully, the Germans will one day have the opportunity to write their own constitution, free of foreign interference, and one which would fully reflect their own culture and traditions.

Stephen Goodson, the writer of this article, graduated in Roman-Dutch Law at the University of Stellenbosch

The article "Why the German Constitution is a Failure", which was published in the April/May 2011 issue of *Impact*, was sent to 32 professors of constitutional law in Germany for comment. Not one of them replied, as well as to a follow up letter. These letters are now placed in the public domain.

The professors and their universities are as follows: Alexy,R.–Kiel, Brenner,M.–Jena, Bryde,B.-O.–Giessen, Calliess,C.–Berlin, Courtier,W.–Köln, Dederer,H.-G.–Passau, Dittmann,A.–Hohenheim, Durner,W.–Bonn, Geis,M.-E.–Erlangen, Groepl,C.–

Saarland, Gusy,C.–Bielefeld, Hanschel,D.–Mannheim, Huber,P.*–München, Kadelbach,S.–Frankfurt, Kirchhof,F.**–Tübingen, Kirchhof,P.*–Heidelberg, Hufen,F.–Mainz, Kluth,W.–Halle, Lege,J.–Greifswald, Magen,S.–Bochum, März,W.–Rostock, Möstl,M.–Bayreuth, Mueller-Franken,S.–Marburg, Paulus,L.*–Göttingen, Pieroth,B.–Münster, Robbes,G.–Trier, Rühl,U.–Bremen, Uerpman-Zack,R.W.–Regensburg, Wächter,K.–Hannover, Wolff,H.A.–Europa, Frankfurt.

*Member of the Constitutional Court Töben Zündel Stäglich

** Vice president of the Constitutional Court

31 March 2011

Dear Professor.....

In his correspondence with his friends, the late judge Dr Wilhelm Stäglich always cited a quotation from Plato: 'Niemand schafft Grösseres Unrecht als der, der es in den Formen des Rechts begeht' – 'No-one creates a greater injustice than he who does it under the pretense of being just'. The attached essay has been written in tribute to what Dr Stäglich had to endure.

If professors of law would teach their students the truth, particularly as it pertains to section 130 of the Criminal Code, then it would not be necessary for judges to imprison and fine freedom-loving German patriots as "thought criminals".

Yours sincerely

20 April 2011

Dear Professor.....

The above article has been sent to 32 professors of constitutional law, including three members and a vice president of the Constitutional Court, yet not one of you has had the courtesy or courage to reply. Not even an acknowledgement or a guarded reply such as, "You have a point" or "Yes, it is a challenging topic". It would seem that the old German custom of Höflichkeit/politeness has vanished. It would appear that the problem is fear. Fear of social opprobrium, ostracism, loss of career, prestige and pension and may be even prison. During your brief sojourn on this planet, which is more important – making an effort to improve the lot of mankind or simply to get along and have a good time; in other words consumerism/materialism versus spiritualism – Geist? The great Austrian leader of the previous century once remarked that Germans could be divided into three categories – the heroes, the traitors and the cowards. Surely, you do not wish to be identified with the last category?

Recently, the German criminal justice system has plunged to a new nadir. I am referring to the latest grotesque show trial in Munich, in which a German prosecutor has demanded that an innocent, ailing foreigner, John Demjanjuk, who is 90 years old, be imprisoned for six years! Ex post facto "laws", double jeopardy and flagrant abuse of the rules of evidence have been employed, as was the case at Nuremberg, where there was a monumental falsification of evidence and torture, and even murder, were used in order to obtain the desired "confessions", Rudolf Höß being a prime example. These "trials" are morally reprehensible and lacking in every form of civilized norms. Is your conscience not disturbed?

It seems that one of the main reasons why the German criminal legal system has become debased, is because it has been infected by a singular human catastrophe, which is alleged to have taken place in the eastern territories occupied by Germany in World War II. While there is an abundance of highly contradictory and contentious eye witness accounts, forensic evidence is absent. Documentary evidence such as orders, plans, budgets etc. still await discovery. If one reads the official accounts of World War II written by Churchill **The**

Second World War - 6 vols, de Gaulle **Memoires de Guerre** - 3 vols, and Eisenhower **Crusade in Europe** one will find amongst the over 7 000 pages of text, as well as the introductory chapters, footnotes, appendices, indices etc. there is not a single reference to this unique human tragedy – not a sentence, not a line, not a word.

The conclusion, which one is forced to draw, is that these three great Allied statesmen, who had access to ALL sources of information, were either ignorant of what took place in World War II or that the alleged annihilation did not take place.

Herr, Professor, you do not have much time left. Germany is a dying nation. With a population growth rate of 1.38% per

annum – less if one deducts the much higher birth rate of the Non-Europeans, there will be very few Germans left in 50 years time. Now is the opportunity to take a stand for freedom, independence, integrity, truth and justice. Deutschland Erwache!

Yours sincerely
Stephen Goodson

NB:

There was no response from the 32 professors of constitutional law in Germany to whom on 31 March 2011 I sent the article "Why the German Constitution is a Failure", and no response to the follow-up letter of 20 April 2011.

Selbstbestimmung für Deutschland! Horst Mahler ist Deutschland



§ 130 ist Fremdherrschaft!

Am **26. März 2011, 1200 Uhr** findet vor dem Gefängnis **Anton-Saefkow-Allee , 14772 Brandenburg / Havel** eine Kundgebung für die Freilassung Horst Mahlers und zur ersatzlosen Streichung des § 130 StGB mit Redebeiträgen von Ursula Haverbeck und RA Wolfram Nahrath statt.

Eine Busfahrt ab Eisenach unterhalb der Wartburg ist organisiert.

Auf der Wartburg hat der Reformator Martin Luther 1521 – vom Papst gebannt –unter dem Schutz deutscher Fürsten das Neue Testament in die deutsche Sprache übersetzt. 1817 –

aus Anlaß des 4. Jahrestages der Leipziger Völkerschlacht – versammelten sich zum Fest auf der Wartburg 500 Studenten, um unter dem Motto: „Ehre - Freiheit - Vaterland“ für einen geeinten Deutschen Nationalstaat zu kämpfen.

Abfahrt: 26.3. pünktlich 745 Uhr am Busbahnhof Eisenach b. Hbf.

Die Rückankunft wird voraussichtlich gegen 20 Uhr sein. Kostenbeitrag 10.- Euro. Anmeldungen zur Busfahrt bitte an Annelore.Guenther@gmx.de bis zum 15.3.2011.



Kevin Käther, the organiser of this protest action, front centre, with supporters from a number of European countries, carrying banners spelling out the message: 'Staatlicher Zwang zur Lüge ist Seelenmord – State enforced lying kills the soul'.



Brandenburg, am 11. März 2011

Freunde rufen für den 26. März 2011 unter der Losung

"Freiheit für Horst Mahler - § 130 StGB abschaffen!"

zu einer Kundgebung vor der Justizvollzugsanstalt Brandenburg auf.

Die Losung "§ 130 StGB abschaffen!" ist die falsche Losung und zugleich eine schädliche Irreführung.

Mit ihr wird der Eindruck erweckt, als stehe der Volksverhetzungsparagraph als Säule der Fremdherrschaft wie eh und jeh unerschütterlich auf dem Boden des Deutschen Reiches. In Wahrheit hat der 1. Senat des Bundesverfassungsgerichts mit seinem Wunsiedel-Beschluß vom 4. November 2009 - 1 BvR 2150/08 - ~~xam~~ durch grundgesetzkonforme Auslegung § 130 StGB und zahlreiche andere Normen des politischen Strafrechts für wesentliche Bereiche der politischen Auseinandersetzung praktisch "abgeschafft". Wurde vor dem Wunsiedelbeschuß die "Wehrhaftigkeit" der mit dem Grundgesetz vorgegebenen Ordnung mit dem Motto "Keine Freiheit für die Feinde der Freiheit!" ausgedrückt, wird vom Bundesverfassungsgericht die Kraft der freiheitlichen Ordnung darin gesehen, daß sie "Freiheit auch den Feinden der Freiheit" garantiere. Auch die "Leugnung des Holocausts"^{ist,} von der Freiheitsgarantie mitumfaßt, es sei denn, daß sie in einer Art und Weise geäußert wird, die sie als "Gutheißung der nationalsozialistischen Gewalt und Willkürherrschaft" erscheinen läßt. So wäre das öffentlich geäußert Bedauern, daß Adolf Hitler nicht wirklich die in seinem Zugriffsbereich lebenden Juden physisch vernichtet habe, weiterhin strafbar.


Wer diese Wende mit der Losung "§ 130 StGB abschaffen!"

im Bewußtsein der Öffentlichkeit vernebelt, stärkt die Feinde des Deutschen Volkes, insbesondere den Antifa-Mob, der - wie Dresden im Februar 2011 gezeigt hat - seine Anstrengungen vervielfacht, die Umsetzung der neuen Rechtsprechung des Bundesverfassungsgerichts mit terroristischen Straßenaktionen zu verhindern.

Ich bin von der Gedankenlosigkeit meiner Freunde, die mit der von mir kritisierten Losung demonstrieren, unmittelbar persönlich betroffen. Sie fallen mir regelrecht in den Rücken, denn ich habe meine Wiederaufnahmeanträge gegen die Verurteilung wegen Volksverhetzung auf den Wunsiedelbeschuß des Bundesverfassungsgerichts gestützt, mit dem Argument, daß mit diesem § 130 StGB praktisch außer Kraft gesetzt sei.

Ich habe den Veranstalter der für den 26. März 2011 geplanten Kundgebung aufgefordert, diese abzusagen, wenn die Losung derselben nicht an die vom Bundesverfassungsgericht mit Bindungswirkung für alle Behörden und Gerichte vorgenommene Kurskorrektur angeglichen wird.

Brandenburg, am 16. März 2011


Horst Mahler

Jamie Kelso at CPAC: Rights versus Interests

Kevin MacDonald, February 24, 2011

Jamie Kelso's experience at CPAC, on video here <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iCdBrAalghY>, shows how far we are from changing the rhetoric about race and immigration.

CPAC is sponsored by the [American Conservative Union](#) which [claims](#) it "represents the views of Americans who are concerned with economic growth through lower taxes and reduced government spending and the issues of liberty,

personal responsibility, traditional values and national security." But, whatever traditional values may be supported by the conference attendees, there is no evidence in the video that preserving White America is among them.

Instead, Kelso was beset by confident, articulate young White people who have completely internalized the idea that America is a proposition nation. Acknowledging that Kelso probably should have avoided arguments related to inherent value in

retaining racial uniqueness if only for tactical reasons, he made several arguments that I regard as unanswerable, particularly if one adopts an evolutionary perspective.

Paraphrasing a bit, he says that all peoples should be able to control a piece of land and to develop their own culture—a comment that reflects Frank Salter's formulation in his [On Genetic Interests](#). Kelso notes that (formerly) White nations are the only nations on earth that are admitting large numbers of people who are racially and culturally different. He asks whether Nigeria should admit 500,000 White people. He asks whether Ireland should accept hundreds of thousands of Nigerians. He asks his audience if they would have any concern at all if there are no White people around in the future.



All to no avail. There's no problem with admitting hundreds of thousands of Nigerians as long as they are good citizens and hard workers, even to a small country like Ireland. In response to Kelso's point that Whites are the only people who allow colonization by other peoples, a woman says "That's why we're superior." I guess ideas of racial or at least cultural superiority aren't dead after all. (Someone please notify [Hideous Heidi](#).) Superiority comes from allowing other peoples to displace and dispossess your own people—an altruism that would leave evolutionists scratching their heads.

The vast majority of the responses to Kelso are a knee-jerk expression of human rights as the ultimate value that trumps all else—a pledge of allegiance to the proposition nation. Using the infinitely plastic concept of rights, White people have no more right to America than Blacks or Latinos or any other race. (Good looking young White guy with an air that he is uttering unassailable wisdom: "We're talking about freedom here.") Nor do they have any particular right to Ireland or Sweden. After all, at some point everyone was an immigrant, even people whose ancestors settled Europe for thousands of years ago.

But whatever argument one wants to make in terms of rights, it clearly is not in the interests of Whites to allow themselves to be displaced and dispossessed, no matter how this dispossession is rationalized in terms of intellectual abstractions. (Kelso: "My fundamental point is that White people have interests.") Why can't Whites ask themselves the analogous question to the one that has forever guided Jewish behavior? Is it good for Whites? Devotion to abstractions like rights rather than interests is a sure recipe for evolutionary extinction.

My view is that this attraction to abstractions is part of the individualistic heritage that is an ethnic trait of Europeans, most obvious in the Puritan/[WASP tradition](#). In the 19th

century, this [liberal tradition](#) could be seen in their attraction to utopian communities and their strong moral revulsion to slavery that animated the cause of abolition. Ideas matter and are worth fighting for—even if more than 600,000 White people died in the war—"Let us die to make men free" as the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" urged. They had the idea that people are able to fashion moral ideals and then bring them into being as a result of political activism. They were individualists who saw the world not in terms of ingroups and outgroups, but as composed of unique individuals. Their relatively tepid ethnocentrism and their proneness to moral universalism—ethnic traits in [my view](#) and in [the view of many in the 19th century](#)—made them willing allies of the rising class of Jewish intellectuals who came to dominate intellectual discourse beginning at least by the 1930s. Even by the late 1920s, the [triumph of Boasian anthropology](#) meant that appeals to WASP ethnicity would fall on deaf ears in the academic world.

The other type of argument against Kelso is that the only criterion should be whether the immigrants benefit the society as a whole in some way—if, for example, they are hard working. That's a more attractive argument, but, as [Peter Brimelow showed](#) a long time ago, U.S. immigration policy is not at all designed to ensure that only the best and brightest or even the hard working come here. Rather than national interest, it's mainly a matter of closeness to our southern border and family connections—the latter concept a centerpiece of [Jewish attitudes on immigration](#) (pp. 277-278) (in addition to maximizing numbers and encouraging immigration by all races).

One could imagine a society that would benefit by accepting other peoples—say an African society that imported a technocratic class. But there is no need to make such people citizens or even permanent residents. Israel, for example, imports foreign workers but does not allow them to become citizens. In fact, if a [foreign worker](#) in Israel has a baby, she automatically loses her work permit and becomes subject to deportation along with her children. In the US, Jewish organizations are strongly [in favor of birthright citizenship](#)—just one of many examples of different Jewish strategies in the Diaspora versus Israel. As always, the welfare of the Jewry rather than abstract principled morality is the basis of Jewish behavior. Obviously, in the long run allowing foreign workers to become citizens would not be compatible with Israel being a Jewish state set up to further the interests of a particular ethno-cultural group. Similarly, policies could be devised that would provide for foreign workers but nevertheless allow the US to retain a European ethno-cultural identity and a commitment to maintaining its control over a territory.

The encounter is a good example of how entrenched the rhetoric on issues of race and ethnicity has become. In the same way, European politicians like [Geert Wilders](#) and [Marine LePen](#) do not question the basics of post-WWII rhetoric on race. These politicians do not use Darwinian thinking that had dominated intellectual discourse early in the last century, only to be eradicated by the rise of the [culture of critique](#) (see especially [Chapter 2](#)). The fact is that these are racial invaders and it's as natural to repel them as it was for Charles Martel to stand up to the Muslims in the 8th century or for a wolf pack to defend its territory.

I suspect that explicit assertions of White identity and frank discussions of Jewish influence will remain over the horizon for some time. But the success of anti-Muslim parties in Europe and the anger over immigration in the US (e.g., the Arizona immigration law) means that a lot can be accomplished without explicit assertions of White identity and frank

discussions of Jewish influence. (See, for example, the current featured video on this site [also available [here](#)]; Tom Tancredo, who polled 38% of the votes in the Colorado governor's race despite running as a third party candidate, defends measures against illegal immigration without resorting to arguments phrased in terms of White identity and interests: "This has nothing to do with race." He has also proposed a moratorium on legal immigration.) All of these movements are implicitly White. Like the Republican Party, the vast majority of the supporters of these movements are White and at times at least, they are pursuing White interests. But they cannot say their name. Because of the pall of political correctness on all topics related to race, they cannot frame their policy recommendations explicitly in terms of White interests.

The fact is that right now it's pretty hard to imagine that a plea against non-White immigration couched in terms of Whiteness would be viable. Kelso's experience is exactly the sort of thing one can expect, even among so-called conservatives. But if the anti-Muslim movement gains traction in Europe as it seems to be doing, or possibly if someone like Tom Tancredo gets elected to high office in the US, I do think that it will open the door to explicit assertions of White identity and interest.

This is the slippery slope argument so often lying in the background of Jewish concerns about any attempt to restrict immigration or single out any group as unassimilable—even Muslims, the vast majority of whom are no friends of Israel. Thus Lena Posner, president of the Official Council of Swedish Jewish Communities: "We are quite upset about having a party [in the Parliament] that says they are only addressing Muslims and immigration. History has taught us about where this can lead, and this is not necessarily good for the Jews" (see [here](#)).

The slippery slope argument is that once Muslims are successfully targeted as unassimilable, Europeans and other Westerners will realize that other groups, such as African-derived peoples, Jews, Latinos, and Asians, are aligned against them politically and that these groups have quite different interests in the construction of culture than they do. One can easily see the anti-immigration movement snowballing as

Europe develops a renewed sense of cultural identity and confidence. And in such a climate, arguments in terms of ethnic genetic interests would quite possibly be an intellectually powerful and welcome defense of the new culture.

This devotion to abstractions by White people has its limits. It's one thing to see it in a more or less racially homogeneous society and when you are not personally threatened, but its another thing when its obvious that the abstractions are leading to a nightmare for Whites. Whites are indeed the most individualistic people on Earth but I do think that we will become more group-oriented and less mindlessly principled when the threats are obvious to everyone.

But for the foreseeable future, organizations like *TOO*, the *Occidental Quarterly*, *VDARE.com*, and *Counter-Currents* will continue to discuss all of these issues—the voices in the background that will put the message of ethnic/racial defense into the thinking of well-educated, articulate, racially aware Whites who will eventually become the leaders of the counter-revolution. The politicians and writers who (implicitly) champion White interests will not express themselves in terms of race for the foreseeable future. But it's a message that will become more and more palatable as the pressures resulting from these mass invasions continue to mount.

ethnonationalism

February 24, 2011 - 1:14 pm | [Permalink](#)

- asks KMD: "Why can't Whites ask themselves the analogous question to the one that has forever guided Jewish behavior? Is it good for Whites?"

KDM: Because Whites are not an ethnic group. "White" is a racial classification, not an ethnic one. People tend to be ethnocentric, not "race-centric". Jews ask themselves "Is it good for Jews?". They do not ask themselves: "Is it good for Semites?". Jews don't care about other Semites (Arabs, Assyrians, etc.). They only care about Jews. So, why would a German care about Greeks? Why would Ukrainians care about Anglo-Saxons? etc.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2011/02/jamie-kelso-at-cpac-rights-versus-interests/>

The Twelve Triggers to create crises and to amplify the call for a World Government:

- 1. Global financial meltdown**
- 2. Deepening economic crisis**
- 3. Growing social upheaval**
- 4. Artificial pandemics**
- 5. Artificial environmental crises**
- 6. False-flag 'terrorist' mega attacks**
- 7. War in Middle East/North Africa**
- 8. Nuclear and ecological accidents**
- 9. Assassination of major public figure**
- 10. Beating up 'rogue' states**
- 11. Staged holographic 'religious event'**
- 12. Staged holographic 'ET' contact.**

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=duls2-ypg9g>